

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/083,769	05/22/98	MCGOUGH	6 3454

GREG T SUEOKA  
FENWICK AND WEST  
TWO PALO ALTO SQUARE  
PALO ALTO CA 94306

MM51/0104

MEDLEY, S

EXAMINER

2836

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

01/04/99  
DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/083,769

Applicant(s)

McGoogan

Examiner

Sally Medley

Group Art Unit  
2836

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 17, 1998

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

### Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

### Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

### Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

  
SALLY C. MEDLEY  
PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 2100

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2836

***Specification***

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

In the instant case, legalese should be avoided (i.e. "said"; "means", etc.).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 and every occurrence throughout the claims, line 8 "the or each" is indefinite. Claim 1 and every occurrence throughout the claims, "the maximum power transfer" lacks antecedent basis. Claims 3 and 4 "said electrical isolating means" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 5, "at least one current limiting elements" does not make grammatical sense (why plural). Claim 7 is wholly indefinite since it is unclear how this claim relates to claim 6. Is the at least one current limiting resistor related to the resistor of claim 6? Claim 12, and every occurrence

Art Unit: 2836

throughout the claims, “the other of said two circuit sectors”. Claims 14 and 15, regarding the last 5 lines are wholly indefinite and do not make sense.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7 and 9-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoeflich et al. As best understood as to what the claims mean, Hoeflich et al. shows in Figs. 1 and 3a plurality of circuit sectors 34, 38, 20, power limiting means MPA (resistor 25), and voltage clamping means 27-29. Each circuit sector is powered by power supply 10 with a power limiting means between the supply and the sectors. The power supply is physically separated (safety area) from the hazardous area, as each component 38, 34 are also insulated from one another, either by their respective encapsulation or by “air”.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2836

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoeflich et al. in view of Herres. Hoeflich et al. discloses all claimed features as stated above, with the exception of the optocoupler. Herres shows in Fig. 1A power limiter comprising an optocoupler 50. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hoeflich power limiter with the Herres optocoupler, in order to achieve a faster method for limiting power between sectors.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sally Medley whose telephone number is (703) 305-3417.

*Sally Medley*  
SALLY C. MEDLEY  
PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 2100

scm

December 22, 1998